

Remarks / Arguments

In view of Examiner's rejection of claims 5-17 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter and further to Examiner's suggested amendments to place application in condition for allowance, Claims 5, 7-9, and 11-17 have been amended to claim "a software product stored in a computer storage medium, executed by processor" as subject matter, Claim 6 has been cancelled, and Claim 10, which is an independent claim, has been amended to claim "a computer-implemented method" as subject matter.

In view of Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 5, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite as to the claimed subject matter:

(i) In regard to Claim 1 steps (E), (F), and (G), Claim 1 has been amended according to Examiner's suggested amendments. In regard to Examiner's view about Claim 1 directed to a "method for graphical development" yet lacking of teaching about graphical implementation, Applicant would like to draw attention to the following:

While repeating step (A) of Claim 1 as part of a loop, user effectively draws a workflow graph and associates a software component with each node of the workflow graph. While repeating step (B) of Claim 1 as part of the loop, graphical actions of the user are interpreted by the graphical software, used in drawing the workflow graph, to construct a set of class objects that represents a workflow-process description. Extracting the workflow-process-related data and transforming it into a workflow-process definition at step (D) of Claim 1 and generating source code at step (E) of Claim 1 completes the process of graphical development. Effectively, user's graphical actions, in conjunction with work performed in the background by the graphical software, are a substitution for human writhing of application software source code.

To emphasize the link between graphically produced workflow definition and generation of workflow application's source code, step (E) of Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating Examiner's suggested amendments and by inserting text "of the workflow application software" immediately after text "Generating source

code” to explicitly state that the source code generated during graphical description of the workflow is in fact source code of the software of the workflow application.

(ii) In regard to uncertainty provided in Claim 5 by usage of terms “where necessary” and “optional”, both terms are no more used in the amended Claim 5.

(iii) In regard to claims 18–20, Claim 18 has been amended as an independent claim according to Examiner’s suggested amendments, and claims 19–20 have been cancelled.

In view of Examiner’s rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Du et al. (hereafter Du)(US Pat. 6,308,163), Applicant would like to draw attention to the following:

Related to Claim 5 art discloses a hierarchical tree of class objects.

In contrast, Du discloses art for “resource management” that includes a “multi-level resource manager hierarchy”, where a resource manager is an individual process instance running on individual physical machine. Du does not explicitly disclose a hierarchy of class objects or a tree of class objects, with or without siblings. Moreover, the notion of class objects is meaningful only within process instance borders and meaningless outside. Two or more processes instances cannot construct a common hierarchy of class objects; neither a hierarchy of processes instances might be regarded as hierarchy of class objects, especially when process instances run on individual physical machines. Therefore, Du does not even implicitly disclose a hierarchy of class objects or a tree of class object.

As the above arguments might require further search and consideration to eventually overcome 35 U.S.C. 102 basis for rejection, Applicant amended the independent Claim 5 by incorporating limitations of dependent Claim 6 into it after cancellation of dependent claim 6, as suggested by Examiner to overcome the prior art.

In regard to Examiner’s rejection of claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Du, Applicant cancelled claims 19 and 20.

In view of Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Cloud et al. (hereafter Cloud)(US Pat. 6,253,369) in view of McDonald and al. (hereafter McDonald)(US Pat. 6,053,951), Applicant would like to draw attention to the following:

Cloud discloses art that incorporates user-interrogated information into a skeleton of source code and compiles it into a workflow object in form of executable code, which can be incorporated into a workflow where workflow object is the smallest unit of work capable of being executed.

McDonald discloses art that relates to generation of "graphical program code" from already created "interface configuration" by using templates, where "the graphical code portions or templates comprise pre-developed portions of graphical code which are configurable by selection or configuration of one or more parameters". In fact, this art teaches parameterization of existing code.

The combination of arts of Cloud and McDonald extends the individual practical reach of each one of these arts, but does not teach or suggest the related to Claim 1 art. McDonald's parameterization of existing source code templates combined together with Cloud's skeleton of source code injected with user-interrogated information is just a sum of both arts, with no new dimension.

In contrast, the related to Claim 1 art is an interpretation of user's graphical input to produce workflow definition and interpretation of workflow definition to perform pure generation of source code.

As the above arguments might require further search and consideration to eventually overcome 35 U.S.C. 103 basis for rejection, Applicant amended the independent Claim 1 by incorporating limitations of dependent Claim 2 into it after cancellation of dependent claim 2, as suggested by Examiner to overcome the prior art.

In regard to Claim 18, it has been amended as an independent claim according to Examiner's suggested amendments.

In summary, Applicant amended all claims according to Examiner's suggested amendments to place application in condition of allowance by incorporating where possible the exact claim language as suggested by Examiner with a goal to avoid raising new issues that might require further search and/or consideration.

Applicant respectfully requests allowing of amended claims 1, 3, 5, and amended claims 7-18.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ivan I. Klianov
Applicant
Tel.: (61-2) 9567-1150
Fax: (61-2) 9567-1160
Ivan.Klianov@transactum.com